

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/942,798	(08/31/2001	Kazuyuki Matsuoka	0425-0846P 9781		
2292	7590	08/05/2002				
		KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER			
PO BOX 74 FALLS CH		A 22040-0747		NELSON, PETER A		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3641		
				DATE MAILED: 08/05/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Group Art Unit	-
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sh	eet beneath the co	rrespondence addre	?ss
Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE THE	REMONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING	B DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defau Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta 	reply within the statutory It, expire SIX (6) MONTH	minimum of thirty (30) IS from the mailing dat	days will be considered tine e of this communication	
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	20/02	1 m		
☐ This action is FINAL.	· ,	<u>-</u>		
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 19			the merits is closed	in
Disposition of Claims			. :	
Claim(s) 1-3/		is/are	pending in the applicati	ion.
Of the above claim(s) 4-12, 17, 19-23	3,2728,30	ナイノis/are	withdrawn from conside	
□ Claim(s)	/ / /		allowed.	
Claim(s) 1-3 13 15 18 24-26	S+ 29	is/are (
	,			
Claim(s)		is/are		
□ Claim(s)		are sul require	oject to restriction or el ement.	ection
Application Papers		·		-
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawi	ng Review, PTO-948			
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	• •	* *	d.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed onis/are obje	cted to by the Exami	ner.		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			•	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority to □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies o □ received. 	•			
 □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numl □ received in this national stage application from the In 	•		•	
*Certified copies not received:			•	
Attachment(s)				
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper	No(s).	☐ Interview Sumi	mary, PTO-413	
Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892		☐ Notice of Inform	nal Patent Application,	PTO-1
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-9	148	☐ Other		
-	ce Action Summary			

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

"U.S. GPO: 1917-433-221/62717

Part of Paper No._____

Application/Control Number: 09/942,798

Art Unit: 3641

1. Claims 4-12, 14, 17, 19-23, 27, 28, 30 and 31 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 7.

The traversal has been noted but the Examiner still believes that the searches of the other species for each of the three components is not coextensive, and would create an undue burden. The inventions are classified in areas not searched during the search of the elected invention.

Also, it is noted that applicants failed to state which claims read on the elected species. Claims 103, 13, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26 and 29 read on this material, and, therefore, are examined herein.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 3, 13, 15, 18, 24, 25, 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramaswamy et al in view of Yoshida and Butt et al.

Ramaswamy et al teach the elected composition, except that 5-AT is used as the main generant, and also that the reference is silent as to the specific surface area of the oxidizer. Butt et al teach the use of dicyandiamides as the generant. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art desiring to not use a hydrazoic acid derivative (as applicants specifically exclude in claim 25 to use the generant of Butt et al in the

Application/Control Number: 09/942,798

Art Unit: 3641

Ramaswamy et al composition. Also, Yoshida recognizes the problem commensurate with manganese dioxide in its usual form (i.e., does not insure satisfactory shock sensitivity) (col. 2, lines 49-56). It likewise would be obvious to an artisan desiring to successfully use the M_nO_2 of Ramaswamy et al to increase the surface area thereof to be greater than applicants' minimum thereby ensuring a successful deployment in the Ramaswamy et al composition.

4. Claim 16 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

This claim would be allowed if restricted to the elected species.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Peter Nelson at telephone number 703-306-4166.

Nelson/cw August 1, 2002

PETER A. NELSON RIMARY EXAMINER